5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

Why does man have this duty? According to the data I have presented, the duty arises out of a promise made at the time of birth. The land is identified with the ancestor who gave the infant its body. The cultivator works not only to 'survive' but also to repay to that ancestor the debt he has incurred by being given a body.

These beliefs are relevant not only to land as a mediating element between living and dead, but also between man and man. The religious system is unconcerned with the consanguineous relationship between the living servitor and the spirit of the dead. It is the service alone that counts, while the capacity to provide the service rests on no more than the authorised occupancy of land. The implication for land transactions between men is that such transactions can never be purely economic.

In the present instance Jarata's brother, in lending his plot to a classificatory brother-in-law, simultaneously passed over the duty to care for the spirit of his dead brother, whose spirit resided on that plot. This is especially interesting as that affine (and his son Jarata (2), if he had lived) belonged to a clan different from the spirit's. Thus, on a religious level, there is no recognition of a clan's 'right' to certain land, but only of a sequence of cumulative co-operative acts between man and spirit, such that each move by one party calls forth an appropriate move in response. We shall now turn to the social aspect of these transactions, i.e. the conditions upon which authorised occupancy is granted.

4. *Transfer of Useholds between Agnates*

In suggesting that land transfers should be studied as social rather than as economic transactions, we may meet with the initial objection that land transfers occur in response to economic needs and are adequately explained without introducing social considerations. But among the Orokaiva, there are many land transfers for which an economic explanation would in practice be hard to find. Certainly there are cases where land is transferred to a household notably short of land, but I know of more cases where the purpose of transfer was to have the company of a good friend on a neighbouring plot and other cases where the only discernible purpose was to make a gift and strengthen a social bond. Crocombe and Rimoldi have recorded a large number of land transfers in Inonda and Sivepe, a large proportion of which were outside the extended family and even outside the lineage. By no means all of these were redistributions to help the deprived. Many were mainly for the sake of strengthening sociability. It is therefore reasonable to inquire into the significance of land in the mediation of social relationships.

We may, first of all, divide these transfers into two broad types: those occurring within corporate groups, and those occurring outside them. In a strict unilineal system, it would be possible to draw a land map showing areas owned by a lineage, and if the system were segmentary, one might speak of a clan domain, a tribal domain and so forth. Such boundaries would theoretically remain unchanged in perpetuity as each generation inherited holdings in the patriline or matriline. No New Guinea system of which we have a recent professional description approximates even remotely to such a model, at least in practice, as we find that many land holdings in so-called patrilineal groups pass into the hands of uterine kin and affines. Among the Orokaiva the departures

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

423 425 611 from a patrilineal norm are so frequent that it is unusual for any man to hold precisely the same blocks as his father who was *enda mama* before him. Nor do clan boundaries and village boundaries remain unchanged for any length of time. In themselves, such departures from patrilineal ideology do not in the least reduce the usefulness of a descent model for the explanation of Orokaiva land tenure, providing that we can plausibly regard all departures from the patrilineal rule as random responses to the vicissitudes of life. In the past, some New Guinea ethnographers have proceeded from this assumption, whereas others (e.g. Lawrence 1967) were willing to recognise structural regularities in the transfer of land to persons other than agnates:

> The potential social relationships which can be deduced from titles to land are of great theoretical importance. They represent an interlocking system of rights and obligations which can reinforce purely biological relationships (those of kinship and descent) within the security circle. (Lawrence 1967:114)

428 423 425 The first question that needs to be resolved, in the case of the Orokaiva, is whether there is really a *rule* enjoining a man to leave his land to his sons (if he has any). I found the rule to be much more ambiguous. If a man has sons, he is expected to leave them *at least half* his land, but he is free to dispose of the other half to others – sisters, daughters, adopted children, for example. Thus a degree of freedom of disposition *is built into the Orokaiva system.* The many cases of non-patrilineal inheritance quoted by Rimoldi, and others I could add, are therefore not exceptions to a rule but the operation of a rule clearly stated by informants. In this discussion, I shall first show on a purely empirical basis that some land transfers are explained by a principle of descent and others on the principle of what Lawrence calls reinforcement of relationships within the security circle. Next, I shall investigate how far the transactional model developed above can provide a principle of higher generality which will sufficiently explain *all* land transfers, patrilineal and other. In the present section I shall concentrate on transfers within the patrilineage.

596 423 [554] We have seen earlier in this discussion that the obligation to 'look after' a plot of land formally arises out of an arrangement between an individual (a newly born child) and an ancestor. In practice, however, the ultimate responsibility falls on the head of the extended family, the 'father of the ground' (*enda mama*). This *enda mama* inherits his title from his father or elder brother who died before him. If he has sisters, younger brothers, children or grandchildren, all [768] these will regard him as *enda mama.* Thus, the death of an individual will not affect the performance of the obligation to ancestors living on the land, as the *enda mama* will either discharge these obligations himself or appoint some other occupier to carry them out.

596 Politically, the *enda mama* acts as leader of his group both externally and internally. In external disputes he champions members of his group against the claims of outsiders. This role is an exceedingly important one and many examples are given where a young man who had a perfectly valid claim to land could not take possession of it because he had nobody to 'speak for him'. (His [627] father was dead.) Internally, in conflicts between members of the extended family, the word of the *enda mama* is final. Nobody outside the family can

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

plexes" (1967: 123). In particular, he stated the opinion that many Melanesian structures '*ne relèvent pas des structures élémentaires*' (*ibid.*: 122). We learn the precise meaning of this statement in another essay, *The Future of Kinship Studies*, published in the English language in 1966. Whereas elementary structures operate ideally within a fixed number of marriage classes, the rules of complex structures are so framed that the system requires a perpetual supply of new affinal groups for its continued operation. They produce a probabilistic alliance network. Rules of this kind are found in the Crow and Omaha systems, but also in many other culture areas, including Melanesia (1966: 21).

Since these hypotheses were published, a number of anthropologists have begun to test them empirically. To mention only two examples, Guiart (1968) has shown the presence of restricted exchange rules in New Caledonia and Kelly (1968) has shown the presence of generalised exchange on Dobu. It seems, however, that a crucial implication of the Lévi-Straussian hypotheses remains to be explored. It is suggested that restricted and generalised exchange (or perhaps restricted and complex exchange) *encounter* one another in the Melanesian culture area. This would imply the possibility of the simultaneous existence in the same society of both forms and some interaction between the two. If such a society could be found, the hypothesis implies that generalised exchange attempts to establish itself there, but *fails* to find a firm foothold, while features of restricted exchange tend to reassert themselves constantly as a result of this *failure*.

The interest of the Orokaiva case lies in the coexistence of the two systems, on the level both of norms and facts. In Orokaiva social structure we may see the two systems in interaction and discover by which factors each of the systems is maintained in opposition to the other. We thus arrive at a model on a higher level of abstraction than those of Guiart and Kelly, but comprising them both. In this model moiety systems are perpetually broken up by forces built into the structure itself: yet the model also predicts their perpetual reinstatement. The model consists, in fact, of a cyclical movement between the two patterns. The reality of Melanesian structure is not exhausted by either of the two patterns taken in isolation, but includes their necessary alternation over time and in space. The dynamic whereby this alternation is produced is the main subject of this chapter.

2. *Patrilineal Groups*

The Orokaiva are patrilocal and have dispersed patriclans. They make many statements which demonstrate their patrilineal ideology: agnates are expected to support each other in war and all other vicissitudes of life, irrespective of their place of residence. The basic inheritance rule is patrilineal. Clans and clan segments have distinctive emblems which are passed on in the patriline and identified with a common agnatic ancestor. One may even hear claims that the dispersed clan is an exogamous unit. All analytically-minded investigators, however, have been aware that this agnatic ideology covered up a very different reality. Williams remarked: 'The Orokaiva organisation very nearly approaches a bilateral system, though in theory it is patrilineal' (1925: 407). Williams was especially struck by the 'laxity' of the marriage regulations and by cases where

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

611 men showed loyalty to their affines rather than their clansmen. He also noted a
614 widespread tendency for individuals to identify with the maternal rather than the
paternal clan. Evidence on land tenure, presented by Crocombe, Hogbin and
[428] Rimboldi, provides an impressive list of exceptions to the supposed rule of patrilineal inheritance and points, in addition, to the feebleness of links between the local groups making up a dispersed clan.

614 At the time of Williams' study, most Orokaiva villages were composed of a
621 single clan and comprised little more than six households. The Australian
361 authorities used a good deal of pressure to make the Orokaiva consolidate their
177 hamlets into larger villages which could be more easily patrolled, but by 1951 Belshaw reported that most Orokaiva still lived in hamlets. In 1966 I found a good number of one-clan villages, with populations of around fifty, but the majority of the people were concentrated in larger settlements in which at least two local clan groups were residing together.

The local clan group was traditionally the smallest viable military unit, whose duty it was to defend the hamlet territory against outsiders. It had its own military leader, feasting leader, technical and magical experts. In the modern multi-clan village, the corporate scope of the local clan group has declined, as its functions have been taken over by the village. Village feasts, village boundaries, village leadership tend to take the place of the earlier local clan group institutions. Due to these changes, the unity of the local clan group has become more difficult to establish and maintain.

614 Crocombe, Hogbin and Rimoldi have provided full data showing that local
613 clan groups are often divided into a number of exclusive segments they call 'lineages', which are characterised by putative common patrilineal descent from an ancestor who could often not be named. It is certainly true that we find important units intermediate between the extended family and the local clan group. First, it is possible to list four names of such major units within the Jegase local clan group and the same number within Seho. But the term 'lineage' might be deceptive unless we define it more closely.

614 If we look at the clan segments in Sivepe (it will soon be clear why I prefer
613 not to call them 'lineages'), their real distinctive feature is that they either came
166 to Sivepe as migrants from the same village or as members of the same clan. There is no evidence whatever that, in their village of origin, they would necessarily have been regarded as close kin. Their feeling of being closely related arose only subsequent to migration. The study of Orokaiva migrant groups, even comprising just a few families, easily reveals that they tend to consist of one core family to which others will rally, not because they are related by kinship but because they want to leave, are good friends of the migrating family and, most probably, have some kin or friendship links in the village where the group intends to settle. It is only after arrival there that they may, for ideological and political reasons, create the fiction of being close patrikin. A number of such groups fuse with earlier arrivals into larger units bearing a clan name adopted by all. Hence, for most purposes these smaller units are best described as 'clan segments', though it may be useful to refer to them as lineages when discussing informants' statements concerning the patrilineal ideology by which such groupings are held together.

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

614 Similarly, the fact that these groupings together call themselves a clan (*javo wahai*) does not imply the actual existence of agnatic connection. The term means 'one name', and that is all they share, except for uterine links which buttress the social relations between them. The clan name is important as a symbol of political identification. The close bonds between the clan segments are evident in residence patterns, in daily intercourse and mutual assistance in practical matters, though not in ritual or other formal organisation.

614 824 The second principle of grouping is the plant emblem (*hae*), already recognised by Williams (1925, 1930) as important in the Orokaiva social system. Williams describes it as 'a distinctive emblem or associate' of a clan, though he recognised it could belong merely to a segment of a clan. Most of them are vegetable species, though almost any natural or cultural object may be designated as *hae*. Williams lists three main uses: as an identity token (to mark a visit by the owner), as a mark of individual abstinence (a self-inflicted taboo, usually shown to indicate a grievance) and as a village taboo post (prohibiting [773] access). The *hae* is regarded as an ancestor, which does not signify, as Williams carefully pointed out, that men believe themselves to be physically descendants [553] of plants, but that the ancestor was a man bearing the name of that plant. Clan and personal names are commonly plant names and often the *hae* of a clan and its name are identical. On the question whether the *hae* is a totem, he remarked that, whatever we call it, 'it will be obvious that it is very much like one.' He noted some forms of religious respect toward *hae*, notably eating and naming taboos.

614 824 To this information we may add that in our experience the term *hae* is frequently used to describe a social group made up of persons sharing a *hae*, and that the group to which it is applied is not the clan (*javo wahai*) but a smaller formation often about the same size as a 'clan segment' or 'lineage'. As such, they are probably the basic larger unit of Orokaiva social structure.

Every individual respects a number of paternal and a number of maternal *hae*. Theoretically, a person passes on his father's but not his mother's *hae* to the next generation so that the *hae* would form an agnatic group. Most individuals have about five *hae* in regular use. I recorded forty-two *hae* names in a population of 135.

There would normally be one *hae* common to a *javo wahai*. Less wide-ranging [582] and more distinctive *hae* would often be of more social importance. Those who were related to the same distinctive *hae* would co-operate in marriage and ● [611] mortuary payments and maintain a strict exogamy rule. Though they claimed their group to be composed wholly of agnates and children of agnates, there were in fact several cases of uterine transmission for more than one generation, especially where marriages were uxorilocal. Some *hae* became unusually popular, like *topu*, a tree name which became a *hae* after a Sivepe woman died by falling off a *topu* tree. She was given the necronym Topugoru, after which all her lineal descendants adopted *topu* as a *hae*. In other instances again, persons sharing the same *hae* were quite plainly unrelated in a physical sense. In fact the membership of none of the eleven most numerous plant emblem groups was drawn from a single clan segment or even a single local clan group.

It follows that the social group called *hae* never has a membership identical with that of a lineage, if we use that term in the sense of Crocombe, Hogbin or

have numbered several thousand at least (nor did they have a 'distinct dialect and a uniformity of custom' that might indicate that they by themselves constituted a tribe).

Every Orokaiva person is recruited by birth to the clan of his father. All members of this descent unit claim but cannot trace[1] common patrilineal descent from a usually eponymous ancestor; they do not always share the same plant emblem (erahu)[2] commonly held by patrilineal groups. A large number of clans are included among the mountain Orokaiva; clan membership does not often overlap with tribal membership (though see Williams 1928:406; 1930:154). It is very rare for the clan to act as a political unit, whatever its functions in the past. Williams (1930:102-8) has in mind a different kind of unit (a small, usually localised group 'united by feelings of actual kinship', scarcely more distant than nuclear family relationships) when he says the clan was 'co-operative... in respect to ceremonies and feasts, and more importantly of fighting'.

There are several clans represented in the great majority of the present villages and fragments of the same clans - what we call clan branches[3] - will be found scattered among similar composite villages, often a considerable distance away.

Clans are not linked to form a wider descent group. Some members of 2 or more distinct named clans, whose ancestors were all at one time known by the one clan name, sometimes profess closer ties to one another for this reason. Jegase clan, for instance, is said to have formerly included groups which have become independent clans.

---

[1] This disagrees with Williams' description (1930:108) which shows no clear distinction between the clan and lineage (see Royal Anthropological Institute 1960:88-90).

[2] Data from Awala and Wasida villages (see Williams 0.83; and Appendix D) differs from the information from Inonda (Crocombe and Hogbin 1963:16).

[3] Note that Williams (1925:410 and 420) uses either the term 'local clan branch' or 'subclan' to denote 'an incipient clan' which has moved away from the parent group but retains either the original clan name while acquiring a new plant emblem or the original plant emblem while assuming a new clan name. Elsewhere (1928:125) he describes how some clans occupy several villages or parts of villages. Some 'branches' or 'sections' may have adopted a distinctive name or taken possession of the subdivision of former clan land they occupy, while others may not yet have taken either step (ibid.).

C13 C23 individuals by creating and fulfilling obligations independently of other members of the descent group.

(iv) Landholding by the local patrilineal groups. After a closer look at landholding by the lineage, we will comment first on non-agnatic and adoptive relationships in connection with land acquisition and then on the interests in affiliation to the dispersed clan branch as a group associated with a territory.

In the instances recorded of title to subdivisions of a lineage's land having descended in 2 or more separate lines we refer to the landholders as members of distinct 'genealogical branches' of the lineage, even if the landholders are parallel cousins. The type of lineage we describe, however, is not characterized by regular internal structure, for often it is not easy to distinguish lineage from kinship in terms of function.

[71] [61] It is as true of the mountain Orokaiva as it is of most New Guinea Highland societies that

> the principle of recruitment to a man's father's group operates, but only concurrently with other principles and is sanctioned not by an appeal to the notion of descent as such but by reference to the obligations of kinsfolk, differentiated according to relationship and encompassed within a span of only two or three generations.
>
> (Barnes 1962:6)

C13 The solidarity of the current relationships between the males of the lineage can be regarded as a function of the closeness of the ties of agnatic kinship, real or adoptive but of close degree, which among the Jegase and Timumu[1] are effectively reduced to a lineal relationship between, at the most, 3 generations of householders. The strength of the readily noticeable identification of the lineage with an estate distinct from the land of the rest of the dispersed clan branch can be seen as a measure of the interdependence between these close agnates.

A lineage such as those in our sample is the largest group whose members co-ordinate their gardening activities to exploit land associated with it. But against this must be set the independence often exercised by individual lineage members, who, in consolidating other ties of their own, acquire and dispose of short-term landrights. Perhaps some individuals co-ordinate their activities with non-agnatic kin, affines and friends as much as with members of their own group.

---

[1] Excepting the Bebehupa: all but 1 of its members (see b6) are descendants either of its oldest surviving man or of his father's brother.

621 with some of their co-residents; nevertheless, common residence
614 implies some community of interest and a degree of group solidarity
that is reinforced by Administration and mission policies which
recognise villages rather than descent groups as functional
[431] entities.[1] Marriages between members of the different clan
[476] branches within the village reinforce this solidarity, which is
expressed in such ways as daily food gifts, co-operation in certain
tasks, and joint ceremonial activities.

(b) Social organisation[2]

614 (i) Descent. Every Orokaiva is recruited by birth into the
clan of his or her father. All members of a clan claim, but cannot
[611] necessarily trace, common descent from a usually eponymous ancestor.
[613] Each clan is subdivided into named sub-groups or lineages which
trace their origin to a named ancestor.[3] A lineage comprises, on
average, three households. Usually several clans are represented
in a single village, members of a single clan (clan branches) being
scattered among a number of neighbouring villages. Lineages are
much more localised in character, frequently being confined to a
single village and tending to occupy one section of it.

[622] (ii) Leadership. The Orokaiva social system incorporates no
central authority or hereditary leadership. Instead, it is
[554] characterised by 'big men' (embo dombo) and an ascendency of
elders who have proved themselves equal to the task. Such men
command the respect of the community - based upon observed qualities
of generosity, diligence, wealth, ability to make wise decisions and
skill in arranging ceremonial activities - but it confers no sanc-
tions.

571 (iii) Residence. Post-marital residence is ideally patrivirilocal,
but in practice people have a wide choice between the village of
patrilateral or matrilateral kin or of affines, and it may be
[592] changed at any time. The composition of individual households
[594] within the village likewise varies, although the basis is generally
the nuclear family. The distribution of clan branches through a
[614] number of villages is closely related to access to the group's
[166] land; hence initial motivation for a long-term change in residence

---

[1] Cf. comments by Belshaw (1964:277) on villages and descent groups vis-à-vis government policy in Fiji.

[2] For a fuller account see Rimoldi 1966:29-75.

[3] Genealogical depth is slight, descent rarely being traced to an ancestor more remote than the grandfathers of the oldest men.